

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-13 are currently pending in the subject application.

Pending independent claim 8, as amended, recites a method for real-time online search processing of shopping requests received from a wireless handheld client. XML is used in the communication between the wireless handheld client and a remote server. An offline database maintains information about a plurality of vendor sites, including URL's, search form URL's, description of domains, and vendor descriptions. The vendor descriptions include generalized results about how product information is organized on each of the vendor sites. A product keyword request, received from the wireless handheld device, is processed, including using the vendor descriptions to identify ones of the plurality of vendor sites which may have information responsive to the product keyword request, and the search form URL's. Real-time price and product information in native languages of identified vendor sites are extracted from the identified vendor sites, and the extracted price and product information are communicated to the wireless handheld device.

Dependent claims 9-13 recite further features of the claimed invention. For example, claim 11, as amended, further recites that the vendor descriptions maintained in the offline database includes delimiter patterns which are used in the vendor sites to identify price, product, and other information in the vendor sites, and that those delimiter patterns are used to retrieve data from the vendor sites. Examples of these patterns are provided in the subject application, for example, in paragraphs 0357 and 0421 of the published version.

Claim 8 has been amended to clarify that the "processing a product keyword request" element includes using the vendor descriptions to identify ones of the plurality of vendor sites which may have information responsive to the product keyword request, and the search form URL's. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraphs 293 to 302 of the published version of the subject application, for example.

Claim 11 has been amended to clarify that the "patterns" included in the "vendor descriptions" are delimiter patterns which are used in each of the plurality of vendor sites to identify price, product and other information in those sites, and that the "retrieving data" step employs these delimiter patterns. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraphs 354-357 of the published version of the subject application, for example.

Rejection of claims 8, 10-13 under 35 USC 103(a):

The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 10-13 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Gottsman et al. (US 6,134,548) in view of Floyd (PTO-892, Item: U) and PRN (PTO-892, Item: V). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Gottsman et al. do not disclose communicating with the wireless handheld client through a remote server using XML, or in a native language of the accessed vendor sites. (See Office Action, pages 3 and 4.) Further more, Gottsman et al. do not teach, suggest or make obvious, at least the following features recited in amended claim 8:

1. maintaining in an offline database, information which includes "search form URL's;" and
2. processing the request by using the stored "vendor descriptions" to identify "ones of the plurality of vendor sites which may have information responsive to the product keyword request," and using the "search form URL's," and "extracting real-time price and product information" from the identified ones of the plurality of vendor sites.

As to feature 1, it is respectfully submitted that the Gottsman et al. do not disclose that "search form URL's" are maintained in any offline database of information on vendor sites. The Examiner has asserted that the reference provides "links to supplier sites" and cited "at least Fig. 10A (1020, 1050) and col. 33, lines 25-38. However, no "search form URL" is indicated in Fig. 10A; and col. 33, lines 25-38 do not mention "search form URL's."

As to feature 2, it is respectfully submitted that Gottsman et al. do not disclose the identification of vendor sites which may have information responsive to the product keyword request, and extracting real-time price and product information from the identified vendor sites. The Examiner identified col. 13, line 19 through col. 31, line 13, and col. 38, lines 1-15, as teaching the (pre-amendment) “processing a product keyword request” element, and the “communicating the extracted price and product information” element, respectively.

It is respectfully submitted that neither of these sections teach, suggest, or make obvious feature 2. The discussion at col. 13, line 19 through col. 31, line 13 appears to describe how keywords are extracted from an “original meeting text” (col. 13, lines 27-30, 44-47) to construct a query to send to Alta Vista or NewsPage search engines. Thus, in the passages, there is no use of stored vendor information to identify vendor sites which may have information responsive to the product key word request. Further, from col. 31, line 12 through col. 32, line 4, of Gottsman et al., it appears that a “Pocket BargainFinder Service Module” is used for Web-based comparison shopping. However, the high level description is provided about the “Pocket BargainFinder Service Module” does not teach, suggest or make obvious feature 2. Furthermore, there is no indication that, whatever the source of price and product information that might be obtained by Gottsman et al., such information is in fact “real-time” price and product information.

As discussed above, Gottsman et al. do not teach the use of “search form URL’s”. Instead, it appears that Gottsman et al. contemplate a “network of approved suppliers” and a relationship between these approved suppliers and the “Intention Value Network” such that the disclosed “Intention Value Network” is able to extract the requested product information “from the supplier’s product data base.” See col. 37, line 56 to col. 38, line 15. It is respectfully submitted that Gottsman et al. therefore do not teach, suggest, or make obvious the “processing a product keyword request ... including, using ... the search form URL’s” as is recited in amended claim 8.

The Examiner has cited PRN as teaching “multi-lingual functionality which includes up to 16 languages and 23 countries, and enabling CNET customers to deliver locally focused (i.e. native language) information on a global scale (V: see pages 1 and

2)." See Office action at page 4. However, the sentence preceding the sentence quoted by the Examiner states "The service catalogs more than 400,000 product SKU's worldwide, and continues to add thousands more each week." (Emphasis added.) Thus, it is clear that the information provided by such service is not "real-time." Further, the "up to 16 languages in 23 countries" phrasing in the PRN reference, does not indicate or suggest that the delivered locally focused information is "price and product information . . . in a native language of the site," as is recited in amended claim 8.

For at least the foregoing reasons it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 8 is allowable over Gottsman et al., Floyd and PRN, and that claims 10-13, as ultimately dependent from allowable base claim 8, are also allowable.

Also, claim 11 is further allowable over Gottsman et al., Floyd and PRN because none of those references individually or in combination teach, suggest or make obvious the "delimiter patterns" included in the "vendor descriptions" which are used in each of the plurality of vendor sites to identify price, product and other information in those sites, and the use in a "retrieving data" step of these delimiter patterns. As pointed out above, the discussion in Gottsman et al., at col. 13, line 19 through col. 31, line 13, appears to describe how keywords are extracted from an "original meeting text" (col. 13, lines 27-30, 44-47) to construct a query to send to Alta Vista or NewsPage search engines. Thus, this material does not teach, suggest, or make obvious the use of the recited "delimiter patterns" in retrieving the price and product related data.

For at least the foregoing reasons it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is further allowable over Gottsman et al., Floyd and PRN.

Rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC 103(a):

The Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Gottsman et al. (US 6,134,548) in view of Floyd (PTO-892, Item: U) and PRN (PTO-892, Item: V), as applied to claim 8, further in view of Pricegrabber (Paper #20050610, PTO-892, Item: UU).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is allowable as dependent from allowable claim 8.

Application Serial No. 10/810,432
Amendment date December 20, 2006
Reply to Office action of June 30, 2006

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance, and the Examiner's indication to that end is respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 07-1896.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER US LLP

Date: December 20, 2006

By:



Gerald T. Sekimura
Reg. No. 30,103

DLA PIPER US LLP
153 Townsend Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94107
Telephone: 415-836-2500
Facsimile: 415-836-2501

Customer No. 29585